REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated September 12, 2006, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

First Paragraph Rejections

Claims 1 – 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement because the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

First, regarding claim 1, the Examiner argues that the phrase "access arranging means for causing the clock for the second data input/output means to wait" renders the claim non-enabling because one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to ascertain how a clock can "wait." Applicants have amended this phrase to recite that the access arranging means causes a clock signal for the second data input/output means to be stopped. This feature is clearly described in the specification, for example on page 15.

The Examiner also argues that the phrase "starting the access of the second data input/output means after the access of the first data input/output means is ended" also renders claim 1 non-enabling because one of ordinary skill would not be able to ascertain how access to the second data input/output means can be started if the clock remains in a "wait" state. As described above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the clock signal for the second

data input/output means is stopped when an access contention is generated. Because claim 1 no longer recites a "wait" state, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 2 and 5 – 7 have been similarly amended. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

Second Paragraph Rejections

Claims 1 – 7 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the phrase "access arranging means for causing the clock for the second data input/output means to wait" renders the claim indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 1 described above in relation to the first paragraph rejections also overcome the second paragraph rejections. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner asserts that the phrase "executing the access of the first data input/output means earlier" renders the claim indefinite. Applicants have amended this phrase to more particularly recite that access to the first data input/output means is executed earlier than access to the second data input/output means. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2 – 7 are also rejected based on the same rationale applied to claim 1. As the amendments above have overcome the rejection of claim 1, the rejections of claims 2 – 7 have also been overcome.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 3, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,499,087 to Fadavi-Ardekani in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,780,843 to Tietjen. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fadavi-Ardekani in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,102 to Peters. Claim 4 stands rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fadavi-Ardekani, Tietjen, and Peters. Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, an information processing apparatus comprising a clock generating means for supplying a clock signal to a first and second data input/output means and an access arranging means for causing the clock signal for the second data input/output means to be stopped and not allowing the second data input/output means to access a data storing means when a contention of access is generated until after the access of the first data input/output means has ended. As depicted in Figure 3, a clock signal 302 is continuously applied to input/output signal synchronizing section 336. However, clock signal 302 is only intermittently input to memory access section 305 via clock wait control section 337.

Fadavi-Ardekani is directed to a memory sharing system and method. As depicted in Figure 1, when there is a memory access request from both first agent 100 and second agent 200, arbiter 102 selects which agent is allowed to access memory 200. However, Fadavi-Ardekani does not disclose or even suggest stopping the clock signal of the agent for which access is denied.

Tietjen does not overcome this deficiency. Tietjen appears to be directed to a power reduction system. However, Tietjen does not disclose or suggest a wait mode wherein the clock to a second data input/output means is stopped when a first data input/output means is accessing

a data storing means. Tietjen merely discloses a method of allowing a data process to shutdown sub-systems in order to reduce power consumption.

Accordingly, as each and every limitation must be disclosed or suggested by the prior art references in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP § 2143.03), and Fadavi-Ardekani and Tietjen fail to disclose or suggest at least the features recited above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2, 5, and 7 recite features similar to those described above in reference to claim 1. Peters does not overcome the deficiencies described above. Thus, claims 2, 5, and 7 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons provided for claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, and 6 depend from one of the independent claims. Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Harness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as the independent claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

IV. Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

Please recognize our Customer No. 53080 as our correspondence address.

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:DAB
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 12, 2007